

REMARKS

Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a), stating that “the second end of the strap being integrally formed with the cover plate, as required by Claim 7; the telephone plug, LAN plug, WAN plug, data cable, coaxial cable, appliance outlet, telephone outlet, LAN outlet, WAN outlet, coaxial outlet” must be shown or the features canceled from the claims. In response thereto, Applicant respectfully directs Examiner’s attention to proposed drawing correction labeled “Figure 7”, as well as to the hereinabove amendments made to the specification, both effectuate for purposes of lending support to the subject matter of Claim 7. Applicant further respectfully notes that Applicant has now deleted from the applicable claims recitation of the following: “an indoor plug wire, an outdoor plug wire, an industrial plug, an appliance plug, a telephone plug wire, a LAN plug wire, a WAN plug wire, a cable wire, a data cable, and a coaxial cable,” and “an indoor outlet, an outdoor outlet, an industrial outlet, an appliance outlet, a telephone outlet, a LAN outlet, a WAN outlet, a cable outlet, a data cable outlet, and a coaxial cable outlet.”

Examiner has further rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In response thereto, Applicant has now clarified and amended the subject matter of Claim 11 consistent with Applicant’s intent.

Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 6-15, 18, 19, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Elliott et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,440,465). In response thereto, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to the claim amendments made hereinabove, and to the following arguments which structurally and functionally distinguish Applicant's invention from that of Elliott.

Specifically, Elliott discloses a clasp member comprising a trough section, wherein two securing straps extend substantially perpendicular from an axis of orientation of the trough. Moreover, the securing straps of Elliott are structured such that a first securing strap comprises a plurality of pegs or studs, and the second securing strap comprises a plurality of holes. In such a manner, the first and second securing straps of a first Elliott device are adapted to be engaged with the second and first securing straps, respectively, of a second Elliott device. Accordingly, this first embodiment of the Elliott securing system requires application of two such plug securing devices for maintaining electrical connection of a female plug head and a male plug head. The second embodiment of Elliott contemplates the application of a securing device, wherein the first and second securing straps of the device each comprise a plurality of holes adapted to be engaged to a plurality of pegs or studs formed on a plug head. Indeed, this latter configuration requires the highly impractical manufacture of a plug head comprising a plurality of studs for engaging this particular Elliott device. Moreover, neither embodiment of the Elliott patent structurally resembles Applicant's device. That is, Elliott does not teach or disclose a plug securing device for maintaining electrical connection of an electrical plug with an electrical socket.

However, to more clearly distinguish Applicant's device from that of Elliott, Applicant has now amended all independent claims such that each said independent claim generally recites that "*said trough region of said clasp member is disposed along a first axis of orientation, wherein a securing strap extends proximate from a base region underlying said trough, and wherein said securing strap is disposed along an axis of orientation parallel to said first axis of orientation of said trough region.*" Applicant respectfully asserts that Elliott does not teach or disclose Applicant's selected structural orientation of Applicant's clasp member/trough region and securing strap, and, as such, respectfully requests allowance of all rejected claims in view of the foregoing claim amendments and arguments.

Examiner has further rejected Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, 12-16, 18-21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kenney (U.S. Patent No. 5,591,043). In view of the foregoing claim amendments and arguments, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kenney does not teach or disclose Applicant's specific structural configuration of Applicant's clasp member/trough region and securing strap. More specifically, Kenney does not teach a trough region disposed along a first axis of orientation, wherein a securing strap extends proximate from a base region underlying said trough region, and wherein said securing strap is disposed along an axis of orientation parallel to said first axis of orientation of said trough region. Indeed, the openings 29 of each of the wing-like structures 19 and 21 of the Kenney device are disposed along an axis of orientation perpendicular to an axis of orientation of each said wing-like structures 19 and 21. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully believes that Applicant's

foregoing claim amendments and arguments distinguish Applicant's device from that of Kenney, and respectfully requests allowance of the rejected claims.

Examiner has rejected Claims 10, 11 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cross (U.S. Patent No. 5,211,573). In response thereto, Applicant respectfully reiterates the foregoing claim amendments and arguments structurally distinguishing Applicant's device on the basis that Cross does not teach or disclose "a trough region disposed along a first axis of orientation wherein a securing strap extends proximate from a base region underlying said trough region, and wherein said securing strap is disposed along an axis of orientation parallel to said first axis of orientation of said trough region." Additionally, Applicant respectfully notes that Cross does not function in a manner similar to that of Applicant's device in its efforts to secure a plug to an electrical socket/outlet. That is, the device of Cross requires two longitudinally extending arms 94 and 96 to be secured to an outlet by conventional fastening means 100 disposed at the ends thereof, wherein Cross does not describe what the conventional fastening means 100 comprise. Once secured to the outlet, the longitudinally extending arms 94 and 96 provide a rigid structure into which a plug may be appropriately secured. It is important to note that Applicant's securing strap does not create such a rigid structure when removably secured to an outlet by an outlet screw, but instead, provides a flexible medium so as to permit free movement and/or adjustment of the communicating clasp member over the power cord sheathing, aft of the power cord plug head residing in communication with the electrical socket. Such flexibility in the securing strap of Applicant's device enables a combination of plug heads of varying size and, accordingly,

secured positioning of Applicant's clasp member over the portion of the power cord just aft of the plug head. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that the foregoing claim amendments and arguments structurally and functionally distinguish Applicant's device from that of Cross.

Examiner has rejected Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caldwell (U.S. Patent No. 3,811,104) in view of Cross. In addition to Applicant's foregoing amendments and arguments structurally distinguishing Applicant's device from that of the cited prior-art, including Caldwell, Applicant further respectfully asserts that Caldwell is grossly structurally dissimilar from Applicant's device and, as such, would not in combination with Cross render Applicant's device obvious. Specifically, Caldwell does not teach a securing strap comprising a degree of flexibility so as to enable the accommodation of varying sizes of plug heads when Applicant's device is in use. Moreover, and as may be seen with reference to the Caldwell drawing figures, the Caldwell clasp section does not, in any manner, grasp or securely retain the power cord. Instead, in application of the Caldwell device, the power cord simply loosely resides within the trough region of the Caldwell clasp section. That is, this trough region of the Caldwell device provides no securing or retaining benefits characteristic of Applicant's clasp member. In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments distinguishing the Cross device from that of Applicant's device, Applicant further asserts that Cross may no longer be combined with Caldwell in an attempt to support Examiner's present 103(a) rejection.

As presented in the amended claims, and as argued herein, Applicant respectfully believes that Applicant's device may be structurally distinguished from those devices of the cited prior-art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all claims.

CONCLUSION

The above-made amendments are to form only and thus, no new matter was added. Applicant respectfully believes the above-made amendments now place the Claims and application in condition for allowance. Should there be any questions or concerns, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Dated: August 24th, 2004

Myers & Kaplan,
Intellectual Property Law, L.L.C.
1899 Powers Ferry Road
Suite 310
Atlanta, GA 30339
Phone: 770-541-7444
Fax: 770-541-7448
E-mail: apatel@mkiplaw.com

Respectfully submitted,



Ashish D. Patel, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 50,177